

He was just starting to deliver a lecture in County, and the following day had agreed to be

na, where he O. P. Brown, who had been a  
and was a man of influence, lived; that he  
and a society existed there for charitable purposes,  
assisting fugitive slaves to escape; that in his  
Mr. Giddings mentioned this fact to John Brown,  
said he would ask O. P. Brown to assist him  
that, owing to indisposition, he returned home  
going to Ravens, and was, therefore, unable to  
promise.

Reason desired to know if Mr. Giddings's lecture  
was a direct reference to the institution of slavery.  
Giddings replied that all referred to the funda-  
mental principles of human governments, to the im-  
perfect right of man to the natural law or will of the  
people as defined by publicists and philosophers in

...inquired if this teaching of the Higher regarded superior to human laws and the Con-

to confound our own ideas. He understood the law to apply only to such enactments as accord with the will; that writers say no enactment invalidating the law is of any moral validity whatever; that any law which seeks to take from an innocent human being liberty imposes no obligation on such a violation.

confers no authority upon those who would claim of either; that it is not only the right of all great sovereigns, but as void, but it is the duty of all to oppose them; that it is the duty of all to recognize these doctrines, declaring that no person can be deprived of life, liberty or property, except process of law; that it is his indubitable and unalienable right.

are a court of competent jurisdiction, and a jury. Such enactments possess no elements of justice. They are gross usurpations of despotic powers, not due to man—they are criminal in themselves, and render those who enact, who sustain and who execute them guilty of the crimes committed under them.

Giddings said, certainly; they are, by society, for committing wrongs upon themselves in their lives, and in all liberty which they can safely to themselves and others.

TESTIMONY OF DR. HOWE.  
 Howe, of Boston, declined taking the oath to testify.

was permitted to enter his protest against the proceedings. By permission, he made the following statement:

Because it is created for purposes beyond the legitimate legislative inquiry.

Because it usurps powers nowhere clearly delegated by the Constitution to Congress, or either branch thereof.

Because it is dangerous as a precedent and liable to abuse.

Because it gives for perversion of the great power of the State the gratification of vindictive party passions in violation of the right of private right and personal liberty, as by disclosure from their homes, in secret, of the contents of confidential communications.

Wittness stated that he had known John Brown for many years, and that he had been in the troubles in Kansas, and had sent him money.

...; they were raised by contributions made for  
of the inhabitants of Kansas; that he expected  
would repel armed invasion by armed resistance  
Brown had gained his entire confidence; that this  
man of tried honesty as well as courage; that his  
troubles had ceased in Kansas, Brown continued  
to himself to advance the cause of practical Abolition.

that in 1858 Forbes wrote to Dr. Howe claiming credit for past services, informing him that Brown, & Co., belonging to the Committee, had intended a demonstration in some slave State, and that he was competent to it; that unless the management was taken from Brown and given to him, Forbes

and expose it; Dr. Howe had never known Forbes. Senator Wilson, about the same time, wrote to Dr. Howe stating that he had been told Brown intended to use the arms and means belonging to the Committee for the purpose, warning Howe against Brown, and that the arms be taken from him; that, in consequence of this, Dr. Howe had been informed by the

such information, orders were sent to Brown to the arms and property of the Committee, the Iowa, Iuto Kunnas, and to be used only of freedom there. Dr. Howe had no means whether the arms were the same taken at Herry, but supposed they were. Witness could not find a copy of the record and of the orders sent.

Witness gave much other evidence, but nothing leading Republicans. He recognized a paper found in the carpet-bag to be in his handwriting.

He did not know of any organization or society carrying out Brown's plan. He believed Brown to be a courageous and honest man, determined upon practicing non-violence, but opposed to exciting insurrection or abuse of blood, except in self-defence. He had given him no comfort as such. Witnesses being pressed to state whether they knew of any other persons who were connected with the plot, they all replied negatively.

TESTIMONY OF RALPH ELUM.  
WASHINGTON, Feb. 9.

Plumb, of Ohio, has completed his testimony before the Cooper's Ferry Committee. The letter written by J. H. Kagi was in answer to an appeal for money to redeem the farm of Kagi's father, who lived in Peru, Ind., which was under mortgages to a Cincinnati bank.

He also testified that he gave money to Henry Brown for the purpose of enabling him to engage in assisting slaves, but that he had no knowledge of the invasion of Georgia, or of any plan to promote insurrection there, and that he had not seen John Brown for more than twenty years, and never corresponded with him.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN A. ANDREW.

He was summoned because the Committee learned through Mr. Christos of this city that he had obtained as counsel for the defense of John Brown, Mr. Andrew. The Committee desired to know what source funds were derived, what interests he had, and what motives influenced his intervention.

Brown stated that when intelligence reached Boston, Brown had been urged to trial without preparation, without opportunity of being reached by friends, and have his case properly examined, and prostrated on his bed and unable to sit up and get counsel, if he had any, the whole proceeding against his mind and that of most people whom he met.

cial outrage, certainly without any parallel in the history of Massachusetts. He supposed Virginia was big enough to conduct such a case with justice and decency, and without being excited by unfounded apprehensions. He confessed, too, sympathy for a man who believed the victim of an idea, and whose misfortune

probably been precipitated by what his family had seen and suffered at the hands of the slave in Kansas. He had entertained a good opinion of a brave and conscientious defender of the free cause, which he considered the cause of liberty and government, in which all free settlers of Kansas North or South, had a common interest.

sequence of his own reflections, and the suggestions  
ers, representing all shades of opinion and as the  
o time to lose, be assumed the responsibility  
ing Southern counsel in Washington and Richmon  
business it should be to secure John Brown t  
and fairest trial of which the circumstances w

He accordingly guaranteed and paid \$1,300 of which Mr. Clinton, of Washington, received a third, and Mr. Green, of Richmond, three hundred dollars. This money was refunded by the voluntary contributions of various gentlemen, when they became apprised of his interference, and who approved its purpose.

compliment. Many contributed who were not  
nearly so much for the benefit of the cause as  
very than himself, but who thought the excitement  
be quieted by a proper defence. No concealment  
observed or desired, in the whole matter. The Com  
inquired Mr. Andrew's opinion concerning Ju  
n's conduct in Kansas, and the transactions at  
to him, particularly horse-stealing, and the P

He had no belief, from information which







